

ANSWERING ISKCON

≡ MENU



Why the verse 16.8 cannot be used against Advaita Vedanta Part 1

december 21, 2021 by publisher, posted in arguments against iskcon, bhagavat gita related arguments

It is quite interesting that Iskconites have upped their game, Mayavaad is Asuric or demonic as per them, they quote Bhagavat Gita 16.8 . Also I find the author's attacks very interesting

“But no matter what, the Advaitins to every objection like a broken tape recorder have a common argument to save the drowning boat i.e. the argument of wrong translation.”

Not quite, we say the translation is wrong only here not elsewhere, even if the translation for Asatyam in 16.8 be taken as unreal, we would still say it does not apply to Advaita at all.

“Anyone with even basic understanding of Sanskrit will know that this argument is absolutely without any basis. “

I love the way the author puts across this. I have deliberately quoted this to simply highlight a particular point. But I love the way he is quite tenacious here.

Let us quote him further

“Mayavaadis provide absolutely no justification for that, they simply redicrect to alternative interpretations. But giving alternative interpretation doesn't negate the translation at all, or even giving alternative translation. Hence what can be asserted without evidence, can also be dismissed without evidence.”

One must appreciate the tenacity and passion of the author. Now the author quotes the Shankara Bhashyam as follows along with Swami Gambhirananda's translation of it.

Following is what he quotes

“असत्यं यथा वयम् अनृतप्रायाः तथा इदं जगत् सर्वम् असत्यम्

“Te, they, the domoniacal persons; ahuh, say; that the jagat, world; is asatyam, unreal-as we ourselves are prone to falsehood, so is this whole world unreal.”

He also quotes the Brahma Vaivarta Puranam which is quoted by Madhwacharya which ofcourse is inconsequential.

But I really like the way this author creates his own strawman argument in the article and answers it himself. Like applying it to Jains and Buddhists. But what is more interesting is that the author has already thought out the Advaitin response,

“Nowadays few Advaitins hold the opinion that Advaita Vedanta doesn't say the world is non existent or false, but simply temporary, hence Mithya. However it doesn't matter at all. Even if we grant the objection, we can easily argue that Krishna is targeting Advaitins in BG 16.8, “

The author again recommends that someone read his article on it. So in short he wants to make completely sure that no Advaitin even answer this. In fact he does not want any Advaitin to even answer this ?

Question is why ?

See having tenacity and calling names is not enough, if you have made an attack with such tenacity you must be ready for a defense as well as a counter attack. I would myself be interested in knowing if anyone would like to counter the articles I have written. That is what makes it fun and interesting otherwise what is the point ?

Now let me take 3 points of his

1. We are arguing that the translation is wrong since we have no escape.
2. Anyone with basic understanding of Samskrutam will understand that our defense has no basis
3. We give no justification we simply redirect it to alternative interpretations.

Now the problem here is that, he is actually insulting Visishtadvaitins over here not Advaitins alone. Also all of these will apply to Sri Ramanujacharya himself, so all of this tenacity will hold on Sri Ramanujacharya, you may ask why ? Since this is the way Sri Ramanujacharya comments on 16.8

असत्यं जगत् एतत् सत्यशब्दनिर्दिष्टब्रह्मकार्यतया ब्रह्मात्मकम् इति न आहुः।

English Translation of Ramanuja's Sanskrit Commentary By Swami Adidevananda

16.8 They maintain that the universe is 'without truth,' viz., they do not accept that this universe, which is the effect of Brahman denoted by the term Satya, has Brahman for its Self.

Now wait a minute here, why the hell is Sri Ramanujacharya interpreting Asatyam as not simply something unreal ? Does he not know basic Samskrutam ? Is he failing to give justification and simply redirecting to alternative interpretations ? Or is Sri Ramanujacharya arguing wrong translation to save his drowning boat like a broken tape recorder ?

Now I think readers will understand why I quoted the author's words ? Now if we go ahead and re-attack the translations of Bhagavat Gita as it is, the author will give the same response to save his drowning boat, that this is as per Sampradaya. So same things can be applied back to the author and followers of Iskcon, whatever they assert without any evidence can be dismissed without evidence. They cannot justify their translations, but we will not divert the topic here, it is not fun to simply keep pointing out the opponent's weaknesses. But it is simply to show a taste of their own medicine

that I have highlighted this point. Now there are a lot of things that can also be said using the Bhagavad Gita alone on Iskconite behaviour but we will not go into that as well. Anyways I have not answered this completely in this post but will answer it in another post for now this post was directed at the tenacity of the author, minus all of this tenacity and ad hominem attacks by the author using Bhagavat Gita as an excuse, there is no intellectual substance in the article itself.

PREVIOUS POST

[Why Brahman being the light of Krishna is untenable.](#)

NEXT POST

[Why the verse 16.8 cannot be used against Advaita Vedanta Part 2](#)

ONE THOUGHT ON “WHY THE VERSE 16.8 CANNOT BE USED AGAINST ADVAITA VEDANTA PART 1”

Pingback: [Good News!! Iskcon finally refutes itself !! – Answering ISKCON](#)

LEAVE A COMMENT

[Blog at WordPress.com.](#)